अतः वहां पर परमाणु विद्युत संयंत्र स्थापित करने की प्राथमिकता अपेक्षाकृत कम है और इसलिए वह इस समय विचाराधीन नहीं है।

नई औषधि नीति

374. **श्री सोमपाल:** क्या **प्रधान मंत्री** यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि:

(क) क्या सरकार एक नई औषधि नीति की घोषणा करने का विचार रखती है,

(ख) यदि हां, तो कब तक; और

(ग) यदि नहीं, तो इसके क्या है?

रसायन और उर्वरक मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री एडुआर्डो फेलोरियो) (क) से (ग) औषध कीमत नियंत्रण आदेश, 1987 के साथ-साथ औषध नीति, 1986 की समीक्षा से संबंधित एक पृष्ठभूमि नोट माननीय सदस्यों के विचारार्थ 12.8.92 को संसद में रख दिया गया है। नई औषध नीति की घोषणा के बारे में निर्णय संसद में पृष्ठभूमि नोट पर विचार-विमर्श के परिणामों पर निर्भर करेगा, यह विचार-विमर्श संसद के चालू सत्र में होने की आशा है।

Recovery into DPEA in respect of Combiflam

375. SHRIMATI KAILASHPATI:
SHRIMATI SATYA BAHIN:

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to the Unstarred Question 1608 given in the Rajya Sabha on 3rd December, 1992 and state:

(a) what is the position of recovery into DPEA in respect of Combiflam and the stage at which the matter stands in the Calcutta High Court at present;

(b) when this company crossed the limit of Rs. 50 lakhs in sales turn-over of formulations and what are the reasons for not taking price approval of other products which were being marketed by them;

(c) in what manner this company is operating without an industrial licence when they belong to Hoechst group and since when they are doing so; and

(d) what steps have been taken to investigate their activities?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTLIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) As per the information available, the matter was likely to be heard by the regular bench sometime in January, 1993.

(b) As per the information submitted in Affidavit in reply, M/s. Carews crossed the limit of Rs. 50 lacs. in sales turn-over of formulations in the financial year 1984. In respect of other products which were being manufactured by this Company during the disputed period, the issue whether there had been any irregularity, is under examination.

(c) and (d) The Department of Company Affairs to whom the matter was referred for investigation is yet to take a final view in the matter.

Ceiling prices of drug formulations

376. SHRIMATI KAILASHPATI:
SHRIMATI SATYA BAHIN:

Will the PRIMIE MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question No. 1606 given in Rajya Sabha on 3rd December, 1992 and State:

(a) the weighted average price of import of Carbamezapine before 9th June, 1992 on which the ceiling prices of formulations were based;

(b) whether it is a fact that weighted average price of Rs. 4364.21 per kg. is a national price based on which producers have been benefited by crores and yet no one's responsibility was fixed;

(c) whether it is also a fact that the exact weighted average CIF price as per Government's own records was Rs. 1400 per kg. in 1990-91 and Rs. 1600 kg. CIF in 1991-92 and on this basis lended

cost would be only about Rs. 3000 per kg. and not Rs. 4364./21 per kg.;

(d) what are the circumstances under which Carbamazepine liquid prices were based still on higher price of the bulk drug; and

(e) what steps have been taken to investigate the matter?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) and (b) Before 9th June, 1992, the ceiling prices of formulations based on Carbamezepine were recommended by DPRC Sub-Committee in its 142nd meeting held on 12.11.1991. The landed cost of Rs. 4364.21/ kg of Carbamezapine was calculated on the basis of CIF price available for the latest full year i.e. 1990-91 duly adjusted for change in exchange rate and taking into account the then prevailing custom duty and countervailing duty.

(c) No, Sir. The exact weighted average CIF prices, as per BICP records, for the years 1990-91 and 1991-92 were Rs. 1435.81 and Rs. 1616.34 kg. respectivly. Corresponding landed costs work out to Rs. 4364.21 kg and Rs. 3730.81 kg. after due inclusion of charge in exchange rate and prevailing rates of custom and contervailing duties.

(d) and (e) As already stated in reply to part (c) and (d) of Rajya Sabha Unstarred Question No. 1606 Dt. 3.12.1992 the higher price was adopted as a special case on the quality and its suitability considerations for the manufacture of syrup only, keeping in view the facts that this formulation meant for paediatric use and manufactured by only one company.

Public Undertakings Manufaturing Chemical Fertilizers

377. SHRI S.K.T. RAMACHANDRAN: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to State:

(a) the name of Public Undertakings which are producing chemical fertilizers in the country;

(b) what is the total production of these undertakings during the last year;

(c) what is the anticipated production of chemical fertilizers of these undertakings in the current year;

(d) the names of profit/loss making concerns;

(e) what steps are taken/proposed to be taken to pull the cronically losing public undertakings out of reed; and

(f) what is the total budgetary provision made for these public undertakings in the last year and in the current year?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICAL AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI ADUARDO FALEIRO): (a) The names of undertakings in public and cooperative sectors producing chemical fertilizers are as follows:—

(i) Fertilizers Corporation of India Limited (FCI)

(ii) Hindustan Fertilizer Corporation Limited (HFC)

(iii) National Fertilizers Limited (NFL)

(iv) Rashtriya Chemicals and Fertililzers Limited (RCF)

(v) The Fertilizers and Chemicals Travancore Ltd. (FACT)

(vi) Pyrites, Phosphates and Chemicals Limited (PPCL)

(vii) Paradeep Phosphates Limited (PPL)

(viii) Madras Fertilizers Limited (MFL)

(ix) Indian Farmers Fertilizers Cooperative Ltd. (IFFCO)

(x) Krishak Bharati Cooperative Limited (KRIBHCO)

(b) and (c) The total production